



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

|                 |             |                      |                     |                  |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/667,191      | 09/15/2003  | Minxue Zheng         | 1300-0007           | 9085             |

  

|                            |      |            |
|----------------------------|------|------------|
| 69849                      | 7590 | 08/07/2007 |
| LAW OFFICE OF KAREN CANAAN |      |            |
| 2225 EAST BAYSHORE ROAD    |      |            |
| SUITE 243                  |      |            |
| PALO ALTO, CA 94303        |      |            |

  

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| EXAMINER          |  |
| CALAMITA, HEATHER |  |

  

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1637     |              |

  

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
| 08/07/2007 | PAPER         |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,191

Applicant(s)

QUINN ET AL.

Examiner

Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 and 35-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 26-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 27, 2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 27, 2007, has been entered.

### ***Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims***

2. Claims 1-39 are currently pending. Claims 19-24 and 35-39 are withdrawn as being directed to non-elected subject matter. Claims 1-18 and 25-34 are under examination. All arguments have been fully considered and thoroughly reviewed, but are deemed not persuasive for the reasons that follow. Any objections and rejections not reiterated below are hereby withdrawn.

### ***Inventorship***

3. In view of the papers filed November 8, 2006, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, the order of the inventors has been changed.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of Office records to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1637

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 9, 12-14 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilton et al. (Human Mutation 1998, cited in the IDS).

With regard to claim 1, Wilton et al. teach a dual-purpose primer for amplifying a target nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein the target nucleotide sequence contains a site of interest proximal to or contained within a secondary structure forming region that, in the absence of the primer, results in an unwanted secondary structure in an amplicon formed under amplification conditions so as to prevent detection of the site of interest, wherein the primer comprises:

(a) a primer sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence other than the secondary structure forming region (see p. 253, Table 1 and col. 2 lines 10-17 and Figure 1, where Wilton et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited); and

(b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure (see p. 253, Table 1 and col. 2 lines 10-17 and Figure 1, where Wilton et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of "blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure" is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid).

With regard to claim 2, Wilton et al. teach the site of interest is a nucleic acid sequence (see p. 253 col. 2 under Polymerase Chain Reaction, where the target is mouse DNA).

With regard to claim 3, Wilton et al. teach the site of interest is a single nucleotide polymorphism (see p. 253 col. 1 second full paragraph and p. 254 Figure 1, where the snp is C to T *mdx* mutation).

Art Unit: 1637

With regard to claim 4, Wilton et al. teach the primer sequence is complementary to one terminus of the target molecule containing the target nucleotide sequence (see p. 254 Figure 1 and p. 253 Table 1).

With regard to claim 5, Wilton et al. teach further including a nonhybridizing spacer between the primer sequence and the blocking sequence (see p. 256, Figure 3 and legend, where the nonhybridizing sequence is the sequence which anneals back to the normal sequence therefore it does not hybridize with the target sequence carrying the mutation).

With regard to claim 9, Wilton et al. teach the spacer is nucleotidic (see p. 254 Figure 1 and p. 253 Table 1).

With regard to claim 12, Wilton et al. teach the spacer is an oligomeric segment comprised of a recurring single nucleotide (see p. 253 Table 1 SB-B(r) and SB-D(r), where the recurring single nucleotide is A).

With regard to claim 13, Wilton et al. teach the probe sequence and the spacer are separated from each other by a means for halting transcription therebetween (see p. 253 Table 1 where the primer sequence is separated from the snap back sequence by the nucleotide G, which meets the structural limitation recited in the claim because the recitation “by a means for halting transcription therebetween” is functional language).

With regard to claim 14, Wilton et al. teach the means for halting transcription is an arresting linker (see p. 253 Table 1 where the primer sequence is separated from the snap back sequence by the nucleotide G, which meets the structural limitation recited in the claim because the recitation “an arresting linker” is functional language).

With regard to claim 26, Wilton et al. teach an amplicon formed by the action of a DNA polymerase on the primer of claim 1 hybridized to the target nucleotide sequence (see p 253 under polymerase chain reaction and Figure 1 and legend).

Art Unit: 1637

5. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bannwarth et al. (USPN 5,573,906, 1996).

With regard to claim 1, Bannwarth et al. teach a dual-purpose primer for amplifying a target nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein the target nucleotide sequence contains a site of interest proximal to or contained within a secondary structure forming region that, in the absence of the primer, results in an unwanted secondary structure in an amplicon formed under amplification conditions so as to prevent detection of the site of interest, wherein the primer comprises:

(a) a primer sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence other than the secondary structure forming region (see col. 2 lines 17-34 and Figure 1, where Bannwarth et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited); and

(b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure (see col. 2 lines 17-34 and Figure 1, where Bannwarth et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of “blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure” is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid).

With regard to claim 2, Bannwarth et al. teach the site of interest is a nucleic acid sequence (see col. 2 lines 21-23).

With regard to claim 4, Bannwarth et al. teach the primer sequence is complementary to one terminus of the target molecule containing the target nucleotide sequence (see Figure 1 and col. 2 lines 17-34).

Art Unit: 1637

With regard to claim 5, Bannwarth et al. teach further including a nonhybridizing spacer between the primer sequence and the blocking sequence (see col.2 lines 25-34, where the nonhybridizing sequence is the linker).

With regard to claim 6, Bannwarth teach the spacer is non-nucleotidic (see col. 2 lines 25-34).

With regard to claim 7, Bannwarth teach the spacer is comprised of a synthetic hydrophilic oligomer (see col. 6 lines 36-52, where the linker is comprised of two propanediol groups linker by a phosphate, making it hydrophilic).

6. Claims 1 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laibinis et al. (US 2002/0028455, March 2002).

With regard to claim 1, Laibinis et al. teach a dual-purpose primer for amplifying a target nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein the target nucleotide sequence contains a site of interest proximal to or contained within a secondary structure forming region that, in the absence of the primer, results in an unwanted secondary structure in an amplicon formed under amplification conditions so as to prevent detection of the site of interest, wherein the primer comprises:

(a) a primer sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence other than the secondary structure forming region (see paragraphs 0010, 0040 and 0041, where Laibinis et al. clearly teach a nucleotide sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited as “primer” is functional language); and

(b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure (see paragraphs 0010, 0040 and 0041, where Laibinis et al. clearly teach a nucleotide sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of “ primer” and “blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region

Art Unit: 1637

to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure” is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid).

With regard to claim 5, Laibinis et al. teach further including a nonhybridizing spacer between the primer sequence and the blocking sequence (see paragraph 0014, where the nonhybridizing sequence is the linking moiety).

With regard to claim 6, Laibinis teach the spacer is non-nucleotidic (see paragraph 0014).

With regard to claim 7, Laibinis teach the spacer is comprised of a synthetic hydrophilic oligomer (see paragraph 0014, where the linker is comprised of chains of alkylene units, specifically polyethylene glycol, making it hydrophilic).

With regard to claim 8, Laibinis teach the spacer is comprised of about 3 to about 50 alkylene oxide units selected from ethylene oxide and combinations of ethylene oxide and propylene oxide (see paragraph 0014).

7. Claims 1, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beattie et al. (USPN 6,268,147, 2001).

With regard to claim 1, Beattie et al. teach a dual-purpose primer for amplifying a target nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein the target nucleotide sequence contains a site of interest proximal to or contained within a secondary structure forming region that, in the absence of the primer, results in an unwanted secondary structure in an amplicon formed under amplification conditions so as to prevent detection of the site of interest, wherein the primer comprises:

(a) a primer sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence other than the secondary structure forming region (see col. 20 lines 31-66, where Beattie et al. clearly teach a nucleotide sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of “primer” is a functional recitation); and

Art Unit: 1637

(b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure (see col. 20 lines 31-66, where Beattie et al. clearly teach a nucleotide sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of "blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure" is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid).

With regard to claim 17, Beattie et al. teach further comprising a detectable label (see col. 20 lines 33-66 to col. 21 lines 1-37).

With regard to claim 18, Beattie et al. teach the detectable label is a radioactive isotopes (see col. 20 lines 33-66 to col. 21 lines 1-37, where  $^{32}\text{P}$  is the label).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilton et al. (Human Mutation 1998, cited in the IDS) in view of the Stratagene Catalog (1988).

With regard to claim 27, Wilton et al. teach a dual-purpose primer according to claim 1, nucleotides appropriate to amplification of an oligonucleotide sequence, and an agent for polymerization of the nucleotides (see p. 253 col. 2 under polymerase chain reaction).

Art Unit: 1637

With regard to claim 28, Wilton et al. teach a dual-purpose primer according to claim 1, a second primer, nucleotides appropriate to DNA amplification, an agent for polymerization of the nucleotides, an allele specific hybridization (ASH) probe having a nucleotide capture region, and color-coded detecting means having a nucleotide capture region complementary to the nucleotide capture region on said ASH probe, wherein the nucleotide capture region on said detecting means is complementary to said ASH probe such that the target nucleotide sequence is identified by the color-coding of said detecting means (see p. 253 col. 2 under polymerase chain reaction and gel fractionation and detection of bands, where the recitation of kit is not given patentable weight and the recitation of “for determining the genotype of an individual” is an intended use recitation).

With regard to claim 29, Wilton et al. teach the detecting means is a multiplex detecting means (see p. 253 col. 2 under polymerase chain reaction and gel fractionation and detection of bands and Figure 1, where multiple alleles are detected).

With regard to claim 30, Wilton et al. teach the multiplex detecting means comprises a detectable solid substrate (see p. 253 col. 2 under polymerase chain reaction and gel fractionation and detection of bands and Figure 1, where multiple alleles are detected and the solid substrate is the polyacrylamide gel).

With regard to claim 32, Wilton et al. teach a hybridization probe comprising (a) a probe nucleotide sequence complementary to a first nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, and (b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a second nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein hybridization of the blocking sequence with the second nucleotide sequence prevents secondary structure formation in the second nucleotide sequence that would otherwise interfere with hybridization of the probe sequence to the first nucleotide sequence (see p. 253, Table 1 and col. 2 lines 10-17 and Figure 1, where Wilton et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of “probe” and “blocking sequence” and “wherein hybridization of the blocking sequence with the second nucleotide sequence prevents

Art Unit: 1637

secondary structure formation in the second nucleotide sequence that would otherwise interfere with hybridization of the probe sequence to the first nucleotide sequence" is functional language and imparts no structural limitation on the nucleic acid).

Wilton et al. do not teach or suggest a kit.

Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation to combine reagents into kit format (page 39).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the dual purpose primer for amplification as taught by Wilton et al. into a kit format as discussed by Stratagene catalog since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in an assay into a kit, "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different reagents have been assembled and pre-mixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not purchase gram quantities of 10 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2). The other service provided in a kit is quality control" (page 39, column 1).

9. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bannwarth et al. (USPN 5,573,906, 1996) in view of the Stratagene Catalog (1988).

With regard to claim 28, Bannwarth et al. teach a dual-purpose primer according to claim 1, a second primer, nucleotides appropriate to DNA amplification, an agent for polymerization of the nucleotides, an allele specific hybridization (ASH) probe having a nucleotide capture region, and color-coded detecting means having a nucleotide capture region complementary to the nucleotide capture

Art Unit: 1637

region on said ASH probe, wherein the nucleotide capture region on said detecting means is complementary to said ASH probe such that the target nucleotide sequence is identified by the color-coding of said detecting means (see col. 2 lines 17-44 and Figure 1, where Bannwarth et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of "blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure" is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid).

Bannwarth et al. do not teach or suggest a kit.

Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation to combine reagents into kit format (page 39).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the dual purpose primer for amplification as taught by Wilton et al. into a kit format as discussed by Stratagene catalog since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in an assay into a kit, "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different reagents have been assembled and pre-mixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not purchase gram quantities of 10 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2). The other service provided in a kit is quality control" (page 39, column 1).

10. Claim 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beattie et al. (USPN 6,268,147, 2001) in view of the Stratagene Catalog (1988).

With regard to claim 28, Beattie et al. teach a dual-purpose primer according to claim 1, a second primer, nucleotides appropriate to DNA amplification, an agent for polymerization of the nucleotides, an allele specific hybridization (ASH) probe having a nucleotide capture region, and color-coded detecting means having a nucleotide capture region complementary to the nucleotide capture region on said ASH probe, wherein the nucleotide capture region on said detecting means is complementary to said ASH probe such that the target nucleotide sequence is identified by the color-coding of said detecting means (see example 10, where Beattie et al. clearly teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of “blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure” is functional language which imparts no structural limitations to the nucleic acid.).

With regard to claim 29, Beattie et al. teach the detecting means is a multiplex detecting means (see example 10, where multiple alleles are detected).

With regard to claim 30, Beattie et al. teach the multiplex detecting means comprises a detectable solid substrate (see example 10, where multiple alleles are detected and the solid substrate is the glass substrate for the array, or any of the substrates recited in lines 11-14 of col. 30).

With regard to claim 31, Beattie et al. teach the detectable solid substrate is a detectable microsphere (see col. 40 lines 19-28 and Figure 15 A and B).

With regard to claim 32, Beattie et al. teach a hybridization probe comprising (a) a probe nucleotide sequence complementary to a first nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, and (b) a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a second nucleotide sequence in a target molecule, wherein hybridization of the blocking sequence with the second nucleotide sequence prevents secondary structure formation in the second nucleotide sequence that would otherwise interfere with hybridization of the probe sequence to the first nucleotide sequence (see col. 20 lines 31-66, where Beattie et al. clearly teach

Art Unit: 1637

a probe sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence which is the only structural limitation recited. The recitation of "probe" and "blocking sequence and "wherein hybridization of the blocking sequence with the second nucleotide sequence prevents secondary structure formation in the second nucleotide sequence that would otherwise interfere with hybridization of the probe sequence to the first nucleotide sequence" is functional language and imparts no structural limitation on the nucleic acid).

With regard to claim 33, Beattie et al. teach further comprising a detectable label (see col. 20 lines 33-66 to col. 21 lines 1-37).

With regard to claim 34, Beattie et al. teach the detectable label is a radioactive labels (see col. 20 lines 33-66 to col. 21 lines 1-37, where  $^{32}\text{P}$  is the label).

Beattie et al. do not teach or suggest a kit.

Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation to combine reagents into kit format (page 39).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the dual purpose primer for amplification as taught by Wilton et al. into a kit format as discussed by Stratagene catalog since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in an assay into a kit, "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different reagents have been assembled and pre-mixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not purchase gram quantities of 10 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2). The other service provided in a kit is quality control" (page 39, column 1).

Art Unit: 1637

11. Claims 10, 11, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilton et al. (Human Mutation 1998) in view of Fisher (USPN 6,054,568, 2000).

The teachings of Wilton et al. are described previously.

Wilton et al. do not teach all of the limitations of claims 10, 11, 15 and 16.

With regard to claim 10, Fisher teaches the use of a non-natural base in a primer (see col. 8 lines 4-22).

With regard to claims 11, 15 and 16, Fisher teaches iso-cytosine and iso-guanine (see col. 8 lines 4-22, where iso-cytosine and iso-guanine are modified nucleosides)

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use the non natural bases as taught by Fisher with the primer as taught by Wilton in order to improve properties such as affinity and specificity of hybridization to complementary nucleic acids. Wilton teaches the presence of the non natural base will increase specificity and affinity with respect to hybridization to complementary nucleic acids (see col. 8 lines 4-22). An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use the non natural bases as taught by Fisher with the primer as taught by Wilton in order to improve affinity and specificity of hybridization of the primer in the PCR reactions used to assess the presence of single nucleotide polymorphisms.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicants' arguments filed July 27, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue that the recitation in part (b) of claim 1 imparts a structural limitation which is not taught any of the references cited as anticipatory. In claim 1 (b) recites "a blocking sequence substantially complementary to a segment of the secondary structure forming region to prevent formation of the unwanted secondary structure." Here the only structural limitation is a sequence which is

Art Unit: 1637

substantially complementary to another nucleotide sequence. The term “substantially” is not defined in the specification therefore a single nucleotide which is complementary to a single nucleotide in the target nucleic acid. Wilton and all of the other references cited as anticipatory teach a primer sequence which is complementary to a target nucleotide sequence. There is no requirement in the claim that the nucleic acid sequence have secondary structure. It is again reiterated that part (b) of claim 1 contains no structural limitation other than a single nucleotide which is complementary to a single nucleotide in the target nucleic acid, and all of the references cited as anticipatory teach this structural feature of the claim.

With respect to the 102 (b) rejections over Bannwarth et al., Applicants again argue recitations which impart no structural limitations on the instantly claimed primer. As explained above, the only structural limitation required by the claim is a nucleotide sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence. This limitation encompasses the only structural limitation of (b) which is a single nucleotide which is complementary to a single nucleotide in the target nucleic acid” and Bannwarth et al. meet this structural limitation.

With respect to the 102 (b) rejections over Beattie et al., Applicants continue to argue recitations which impart no structural limitations on the instantly claimed primer. As explained above, the only structural limitation required by the claim is a nucleotide sequence complementary to a segment of the target nucleotide sequence. This limitation encompasses the only structural limitation of (b) which is a single nucleotide which is complementary to a single nucleotide in the target nucleic acid” and Beattie et al. meet this structural limitation.

With respect to all of the 103 (a) rejections in view of the stratagene catalog, Applicants argue the primary references in each of the rejections do not anticipate the independent claim from which the kit claims depend and that the Stratagene catalog does not cure the deficiencies. This argument is moot with the clarification of each of the 102 (b) rejections over the independent claim.

Art Unit: 1637

With respect to the 103 (a) rejection over Wilton in view of Fisher, Applicants argue Wilton does not anticipate the independent claim from which claims 10, 11, 15 and 16 depend and that Fisher does not cure the deficiencies. This argument is moot with the clarification of each of the teachings of Wilton with respect to the independent claim.

*Summary*

13. No claims were allowable.

*Conclusion*

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

*Correspondence*

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather G. Calamita whose telephone number is 571.272.2876 and whose e-mail address is heather.calamita@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at 571.272.0782.

Papers related to this application may be faxed to Group 1637 via the PTO Fax Center using the fax number 571.273.8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to 571.272.0547.

Art Unit: 1637

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

hgc

TERESA E. STRZELECKA, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Teresa Strzelecka*  
8/2/07